DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 338 EC 192 435

TITLE	Special Education Training and Resource Center Program (SETRC) 1984-85. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	New York State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE	Oct 86
NOTE	38p.; Prepared by Special Education Evaluation Unit.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; *Disabilities; Educational Methods; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Mainstreaming; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Parents; *Program Evaluation; Special Education; Special Education Teachers; Teacher Workshops; Technical Assistance; Vocational Education Teachers; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This report presents the evaluation of the 1984-85 Special Education Training and Resource Center Program (SETRC) of the Division of Special Education of the New York City Public Schools. The program provided training activities to: (1) support the transition to new state regulations by training special and general educational personnel; (2) meet local needs by training special educators and parents of special education students; and (3) meet state training objectives in Division priorities. This was the second of a 2-year phase-in of the Part 200.6 Regulations. Additional purposes during the phase-in were to: develop awareness of the implications of grouping by function rather than by handicapping condition; and promote consistency between general and special education curricula under the Regents' Action Plan. During 1984-85, 31,338 participants were served in 2,603 training sessions totaling 7,042 hours. Objectives were not fully met for occupational educational personnel, parents, parents and teachers of preschool handicapped children, Regents' Action Plan initiatives, and teaching limited English proficient students. Reasons for the failure to fully meet objectives for the latter areas are given, as are recommendations for improving the impact of the program. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED281338

7617

SPECIAL EDUCATION TRAINING
AND RESOURCE CENTER
PROGRAM (SETRC)
1984-85

OEA Evaluation Report

EC192435

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FINAL REPORT

October, 1986

Robert Tobias, Administrator
Judith S. Torres, Senior Manager

SPECIAL EDUCATION TRAINING AND RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM (SETRC) 1984-85

Division of Special Education
Edward Sermier, Chief Administrator

Reimbursable Programs Unit
Allison Tupper

Prepared by:

O.E.A./Special Education Evaluation Unit

Ronald C. Miller, Evaluation Manager
Marcia Torres, Evaluation Specialist
Arnold Simmel, Evaluation Specialist
Tomi Berney, Evaluation Specialist

Ellen Goldsmith, Evaluation Consultant
Lynn Mulkey, Evaluation Consultant

EC 192536

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard Guttenberg
NYC Board of Education
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION

The Special Education Training and Resource Center Program (SETRC) was funded by a State Education Department (S.E.D.) grant under Part B of the Education for all Handicapped Children Act and operated by the Staff Development Unit of the Division of Special Education (D.S.E.) of the New York City Board of Education. It was designed to provide specified numbers of hours of training activities to fulfill specified objectives which related to goals for special education. In this second year of program implementation, the three major focuses were: (1) to support the successful transition to the Part 200.6 Regulations; (2) to conduct training activities to meet local needs related to educating students with handicapping conditions and; (3) to conduct training activities related to the Regents' Action Plan. The Office of Educational Assessment (O.E.A.) evaluated the extent and quality of the training provided by SETRC by reviewing program documents, analyzing participant evaluation forms, and interviewing a sample of trainers.

During the 1984-85 school year, 31,338 participants were served in 2,603 training sessions for a total of 7,042 hours. All program objectives were fully or partially met. In the following areas, training surpassed the proposed number of hours and the objective was met for the following personnel and issues: general education personnel, non-special education support personnel, local needs, computer management systems, and personnel in non-school residences. Although training took place in the following areas, projected goals were not met: occupational education personnel, parents, parents and teachers of pre-school handicapped children, Regents' Action Plan initiatives, and teaching LEP students. The inability to fully meet these program objectives arose from a number of problems: the lack of time in a teacher's day for training, the lack of sufficient SETRC personnel to meet the training objectives, and the difficulty of attracting certain kinds of participants to training activities.

SETRC contributed essential services to both special education and general education personnel. In 1984-85, for example, SETRC training facilitated the transition to the Part 200.6 Regulations and promoted their implementation. SETRC training addressed teachers' instructional and management concerns, and provided training about special education students to general education personnel.

The following recommendations are aimed at improving the impact of the program.

- Encourage the various trainers of D.S.E.'s Staff Development Unit to regularly share ideas and materials.

- Continue to provide trainers with training experiences that develop their knowledge of the content of training topics, as well as new staff development methods.

- Encourage the development of a workshop-series model which would provide greater opportunities for feedback from participants on the application of practical workshop topics.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	
	SETRC Organization	2
	Purposes	3
	Population Served	4
	Training	5
	Role of Trainers	5
	Training Activities	5
	Training Topics	6
II.	METHODOLOGY	7
III.	FINDINGS	9
	Program Objectives	9
	Participant Evaluation	21
	Summary of Participant Evaluation	27
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	29

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
TABLE 1:	Total Hours of Workshop Training for Each Objective Area	10
TABLE 2:	Training Areas Within Local Needs	14

I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the evaluation of the 1984-85 Special Education Training and Resource Center Program (SETRC) of the Division of Special Education (D.S.E.) of the New York City Public Schools. The purpose of the program was to provide training activities to meet the following broad goals: to support the transition to the New York State Commissioner of Education's Regulations, Part 200.6, by providing training to special and general education personnel; to meet local needs related to students with handicapping conditions by providing training to special educators and to parents of special education students; and to conduct training activities to meet State Education Department (S.E.D.) training objectives and D.S.E. priorities.

The 1984-85 school year represented the second of a two-year phase in of the Part 200.6 Regulations which replace the Part 200.14 Regulations and set specific criteria for recommendations into program service categories as well as guidelines for classroom placement. A major purpose of training during the phase-in of the 200.6 Regulations was to develop awareness of the implications of functional grouping in contrast to grouping by handicapping condition.

An additional major training focus was promoting consistency between general and special education curricula under the Regents' Action Plan, which became effective September 1, 1985.

SETRC ORGANIZATION

SETRC is one of a number of training programs for which the Staff

Development Unit of the D.S.E. is responsible. These programs, under the auspices of a staff development coordinator, often work in conjunction with other local, state, and federally-funded training programs. SETRC, however, is unique in its scope and mission.

Within New York State, various local educational agencies form a SETRC network. SETRC trainers from all participating local educational agencies meet in Albany for staff training three times a year. For its operation during the year, the New York State Education for All Handicapped Children Act (E.H.A.) provides discretionary funds apportioned to the various local educational agencies to be used for specified training objectives which relate to S.E.D. special education goals. S.E.D. requires that a particular number of hours of training take place. Given that various local agencies have different needs, some negotiations about objectives and training levels take place between the state and the local agencies. For New York City SETRC to accomplish its goals for the 1984-85 school year, SETRC received approximately one million dollars.

The New York City SETRC organization, by far the largest in the state, consists of a centrally-based "hub" made up of three SETRC teacher trainers located at the Board of Education central offices, and the regional "spokes", consisting of three trainers at each of the five special education regional offices. In addition, there were three SETRC teacher trainers who designed and conducted training activities for high school personnel and one SETRC teacher trainer who served personnel in citywide programs. In all, there were 22 trainers.

SETRC's organization provided a "training-of-trainers" model for new workshops, with central trainers presenting workshops to regional trainers who then trained district personnel. Because SETRC's organization allowed the various regions to determine their own needs, regional SETRC trainers could be responsive to local concerns.

PURPOSES

SETRC was designed to meet both D.S.E. and S.E.D. priorities. In addition to the goals cited above, another important thrust of training was to meet local needs related to educating students with handicapping conditions.

In the second year of the Part 200.6 Regulations phase-in, personnel in the regions already operating under the new regulations needed continued support in following new procedures and in the implementation of functional grouping within the new program/service categories; the regions in the process of adopting these regulations needed specific training in the philosophy and procedures of functional grouping under 200.6. Trainers provided workshops and technical assistance to teachers, Committee on the Handicapped/School Based Support Team (C.O.H./S.B.S.T.) personnel, administrators, supervisors, and general education personnel.

The second major focus was on training activities to promote the equivalence of general and special education curricula. Training workshops covered such content areas as reading, math, language arts, critical thinking, and writing strategies. They addressed the issue of incorporating general education minimum teaching essentials into the D.S.E. curriculum.

In comparison to 1983-84, there was a greater emphasis on training designed to encourage special education parents to play a larger role in their child's education by equipping them to work with their child at home. Another area of increased emphasis was training related to the increasing number of limited English-proficient (LEP) students entering the school system. Still another important area of emphasis included training for general educators, occupational educators, and general education support personnel in working with mainstreamed handicapped students.

The third focus of the program involved the Regents' Action Plan, which informed secondary school special education personnel about requirements for providing special education students with access to occupational and vocational education opportunities for high school graduation. Under this plan, the requirements for graduation in New York State were extended to include special education students.

POPULATION SERVED

SETRC served a varied audience that included both special and general education personnel. Within special education, SETRC served teachers, administrators, supervisors, paraprofessionals, C.O.H./S.B.S.T. personnel, and other SETRC trainers. Within general education, SETRC served teachers, administrators, and support staff. Other constituencies included parents, agency personnel, college personnel, and college students. In some cases participants were required to attend workshops, while in others workshop attendance was voluntary.

TRAINING

Roles of Trainers

The centrally-based SETRC trainers were responsible for preparing training modules, disseminating and collecting data, and conducting central and special interest group training. Their primary function was to serve as liaison between the regions and the central office. Regional trainers conducted workshops, made field visits to new and veteran teachers, and created and disseminated materials relating to the three major emphases of the project.

Training Activities

There were two types of training: workshops and technical asistance. Workshops consisted of either single events or workshop series with agenda prepared by trainers. These agendas often reflected participant requests. Additionally, trainers often modified the content of a future workshop based on participants' comments at a prior workshop. Workshop series provided instruction to eight or more participants for more than five hours per topic.

Technical assistance services included information dissemination as well as on-site visits. Often, as a result of telephone requests, trainers prepared and provided information or materials. On-site technical assistance consisted of school visits in which trainers either met during lunch with a small group of teachers or worked in the classroom with individual teachers.

Training Topics

A range of topics were presented for each of the major training

goals. Training concerned with the Part 200.6 Regulations included topics such as the philosophy of functional grouping and understanding the I.E.P. process. Instructional issues included both behavior management and classroom management; development of reading, math, writing, and thinking abilities; and adapting the Minimum Teaching Essentials for special education. A very special part of local needs training was the Building Bridges Institute which presented numerous workshops covering a broad spectrum of topics. In parent training, topics included a general orientation to special education, an overview of the social, and emotional needs of students with handicapping conditions, and presentations on the Part 200.6 Regulations, I.E.P. and annual review procedures, facilitation of daily life skills, and special education programs and goals.

For training in working with LEP students, topics included: information about English as a Second Language (E.S.L.); information about assessment techniques and instructional materials; and training in relevant compliance procedures, techniques of behavior management and instructional management, and promoting awareness of multicultural education.

Training in the Regents' Action Plan included topics such as the Basic II Curriculum (which deals with functional life skills) and the implementation of the Minimum Teaching Essentials.

The following chapter presents the evaluation methodology. Chapter III presents the findings by objective and includes an analysis of participant evaluations; Chapter IV presents conclusions and recommendations.

II. METHODOLOGY

In evaluating the 1984-85 SETRC Program, the Office of Educational Assessment (O.E.A.) determined the extent and quality of the training provided by SETRC with regard to those objectives specified by S.E.D. Thus, the two evaluation questions were:

- Did the program meet its objectives in providing the specified amount of training in the targeted areas?
- Did the program provide effective training according to the perceptions of participants and trainers?

To answer the first question, the evaluation team reviewed program documents which included the following information for each objective: type of training (single, intensive), training topic, and number and type of participants. The primary focus in reviewing these documents was to determine whether training goals were met. In addition, the team determined the number of sessions and participants for each objective and examined the range of workshop topics within each objective.

To answer the second question, the evaluation team examined the reactions of both participants and trainers. In order to examine participants' perceptions of the program's effectiveness, O.E.A.-constructed evaluation forms asked participants to compare the extent of their knowledge of the topic before and after training and to rate the work shop presentation on its usefulness and quality. Participants also provided comments and suggestions. Trainers distributed and collected these forms at training sessions, reviewed them to gauge the sessions' effectiveness and to determine additional training needs, and then forwarded the forms to O.E.A. for analysis. In total, there were 16,882

participant evaluation forms.

In order to examine trainers' perceptions of the program's effectiveness, O.E.A. personnel conducted interviews with a sample of nine (43 percent) trainers. Each of the five special education regions were represented, as well as citywide, high school, and central SETRC assignments. Typically, these interviews were linked to workshop observations and consisted of informational and evaluative questions. Informational questions asked about the services trainers provided, the audience they served, the way they determined local needs, their methods of publicizing services, the kind of training and materials they received, their training focus for the rest of the year, and their preparations for the year to come. Evaluation questions concerned trainers' feelings about the adequacy of the materials and training they received; their opinion of which goals were difficult to meet and why, their assessment of the factors which enhanced and detracted from the implementation of the SETRC program, and their perceptions of its most significant accomplishments.

III. FINDINGS

In order to achieve its goals the SETRC program is required to deliver a specified number of training hours for each particular program objective. The first evaluation objective was to determine if the program provided a sufficient amount of training for each of the nine objectives established by the S.E.D. The second evaluation objective was to determine whether participants found the workshops to be useful and effective. These two evaluation objectives are discussed in detail below.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The total number of hours and sessions of workshop training for each objective is summarized in Table 1. According to this Table, 2,603 sessions of training served 31,338 participants, representing 7,042 hours of training. The specific goal and level of attainment for each objective is delineated below.

Training of General Education Personnel

Objective 1.1. To provide 50 hours of training for general educators.

The intent of this objective was to provide general education personnel with the knowledge and skills to enable them to work effectively with children with handicapping conditions. Graduate-credit in-service courses were developed and presented in conjunction with faculty from Adelphi University and Long Island University. General education teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals took courses which

TABLE 1

Total Hours of Workshop Training for each Objective Area

Objectives		Number of Sessions	Total Number of Hours	Number of Participants
1.1	Training of General Education Personnel	47	554	658
1.2	Training of Occupational Education Personnel	7	13	34
1.3	Training for Non-Special Education Support Personnel	175	409	3,801
2.0	Training Based on Local Needs	1,790	4,445	21,999
3.0	Training to Board of Education Members	5	2	11
4.1	Training for Parents	162	394	1,767
4.2	Training for Parents and Teachers of Pre-School Handicapped Children	3	4	180
5.1	Training in Regents' Action Plan Initiatives	216	655	1,953
5.2	Training in Computers	6	33	79
7.0	Training in Teaching LEP Students	174	504	1,722
8.0	Training in Teaching Children in Other Residences	18	29	78
	TOTAL	2,603	7,042	31,338

covered a range of areas relevant to the education of handicapped students. Some courses focused on specific populations -- the mentally retarded, learning disabled, and emotionally disturbed. Others focused on content areas such as teaching reading to the exceptional child and creative arts for the exceptional child; still others addressed such issues as behavior modification, diagnosis, and testing. Courses met for one term with an average of 30 students per class.

Five hundred fifty-four hours of training were provided, greatly surpassing that which was proposed. The amount of training offered represented more than eleven times the projected number of hours; thus the objective was attained.

Training of Vocational and Occupational Education Personnel

Objective 1.2. To provide 50 hours of training to occupational education personnel.

The intent of this objective was to provide occupational education personnel with knowledge and skills that would improve their ability to meet the needs of special education students. SETRC trainers presented seven workshops on the Part 200.6 Regulations and compliance issues to occupational education personnel. Because of the difficulty in recruiting occupational educators for workshops, only 13 hours of training were provided. Thus, the objective was not attained.

Training of Support Personnel

Objective 1.3. To provide 200 hours of training to non-special education support staff (i.e., related service providers, guidance counselors, psychologists, nurses, social workers, and physicians) in the knowledge and skills necessary to work effectively with children with handicapping conditions.

The great majority of the training sessions (128 out of 167 workshops)

addressed the Part 200.6 Regulations and compliance procedures. In addition, general education support personnel received information about clinical activities, special education programs, goals and organization, behavioral management, and the adaptation of methods and materials for the special education student.

The level of activity surpassed that which was proposed with 409 hours of training. This was more than double the projected number of hours. Thus, the objective was attained.

Training Based on Local Needs

Objective 2.0. To provide 4,000 hours of training based on identified local needs to individuals involved in the education of children with handicapping conditions.

This objective was designed to address the critical issues facing special education. During the 1984-85 school year, it was necessary to focus attention on the full implementation of the Part 200.6 Regulations in two regions and in certain citywide programs, and the transition to the new regulations in other areas of New York City. Another new focus was the equivalency of special and general education curricula, including the incorporation of Minimum Teaching Essentials into the D.S.E. curriculum. Training centered on promoting an increased awareness of the general education curriculum. The hiring of large numbers of new special education staff created a need for basic training with regard to special education programs and goals as well as management and curriculum issues.

Within this general framework, particular local needs were determined by the following procedure. First, trainers spoke at supervisory meetings about the kinds of workshops available. Supervisors then arranged for

workshops on requested topics. Needs assessments as well as participants' comments on workshop evaluation forms also provided trainers with information about training needs.

In the various regions, different training priorities emerged. In Manhattan, the emphasis was on understanding the change in regulations, addressing LEP student issues, and serving such special populations as educable mentally retarded (E.M.R.) and physically disabled students in anticipation of the 200.6 conversion. In the Bronx, the focus of local needs training was on compliance issues and training for resource room teachers. Brooklyn West was very concerned with providing an orientation for teachers at the beginning of the year. Brooklyn East focused both on classroom management issues growing from the 200.6 conversion and on reading, math, and writing strategies. Queens, like Brooklyn West, focused on the whole I.E.P. process as well as the Regents' Action Plan. Citywide training focused on the teaching of writing and critical questioning. Finally, training offered by trainers assigned to the Board of Education central office covered the transition to the Part 200.6 Regulations, educating physically disabled students, and teaching writing and thinking strategies.

SETRC offered 1,790 workshops to 21,999 participants. While workshops were offered on a range of topics, the majority dealt with three areas (see Table 2). A total of 11,289 participants attended 784 workshops related to the Part 200.6 Regulations accounting for 1,697 training hours. On the topics of instructional methods and materials and instructional management, 7,610 participants attended 462 workshops, accounting for 1,555 hours. Behavior management represented another major focus of

TABLE 2

Areas of Training Offered to Meet Local Needs

Topics	Number of Sessions	Total Number of Hours	Number of Participants
200.6 Activities:			
Regulations			
Compliance Activities	784	1,697	11,289
Clinical Activities			
Methods and Materials			
Instructional Manangement	462	1,555	7,610
Behavior Management	155	326	1,480

activity with 155 workshops presented to 1,480 special educators, accounting for a total of 326 training hours. The amount of attention devoted to these areas indicates that the needs within special education do indeed reflect both D.S.E. and S.E.D. priorities.

Another aspect of local needs training which deserves special mention is the second annual Building Bridges Institute. This day-long conference, drew on the expertise of special education personnel, university professors, government and community agency professionals, parents, and former special education students. The institute began with a plenary session, which featured Dr. Martin J. Kaufman of the United States Department of Education speaking on "The Role of Special Education in the 80's". There were 50 workshops and panels on a wide range of topics of interest to both special education and general education staff. Broad areas included instruction, assessment, bi-lingual issues, sex education, and the use of computers. There were also exhibits and demonstrations of instructional and testing materials as well as artwork by students and a Special Events Theater. At this institute, SETRC trainers delivered 38 hours of training for 361 participants.

Within a wide range of activities, 4,445 hours of local needs training were provided. Thus, the objective was essentially met.

Training for Board of Educaton Members

Objective 3.0. To provide Board of Education members and their staff with training information concerning their roles and responsiblities relating to education of children with handicapping conditions.

The intent of this objective was to help school board members to become familiar with the Part 200.6 Regulations and with the character-

istics of students with handicapping conditions. It was expected that this increased knowledge and understanding would better equip districts to meet the needs of students with handicapping conditions.

Techniques for doing so included distributing Strategies and Practices, a newsletter of special education, and providing information on request, SETRC conducted 2 workshops for school board members--two sessions on the Part 200.6 Regulations and on compliance procedures in relation to the I.E.P. A total of 2 hours of training was provided to 11 participants There were no goal hours mandated for this objective.

Training for Parents of Children with Handicapping Conditions

Objective 4.1. To provide 1,200 hours of training to parents of school-age children.

The intent of this objective was to foster each parent's involvement in the education of his or her handicapped child. Workshops presented information designed to promote greater parent participation in the referral, evaluation, and placement of their child. Additional workshops familiarized parents with the I.E.P. process and presented them with models of the various forms used in special education. Other workshops aimed to acquaint parents with their rights. There were also workshops that focused on defining the various handicapping conditions and outlined principles and strategies for working with students at home. These workshop topics included: working with students at home; techniques for language development; and learning through trips.

While connections were established with other parent groups such as Project Reach Out to Parents (ROPO), it was still difficult to attract a large number of parents to training sessions. Thus, 394 hours of

training were provided to 1,767 participants. Since this fell short of the projected goal, the objective was not attained.

Training for Parents and Teachers of Pre-School-Age Handicapped Children

Objective 4.2. To provide 450 hours of training to parents and teachers of pre-school-age handicapped children.

The intent of this objective was to acquaint both parents and teachers of pre-school-aged youngsters who have handicapping conditions with the Board of Education's programs for special education students. However, since pre-school-age special education youngsters are usually not included in the population served by the Board of Education, it was difficult to gain access to their parents and teachers. Nevertheless, three workshops attended by 180 parents were presented for a total of four hours: two detailed the Part 200.6 Regulations; the other highlighted special education programs and goals. Because the level of activity fell short of the projected goal, the objective was not attained.

Training in Regents' Action Plan Initiatives

Objective 5.1. To provide 2,060 hours of training to secondary education teachers in issues relating to diploma and certificate requirements, equivalency of instruction, and student general education curriculum requirements.

The need for this new objective grew from the Regents' Action Plan, which mandated new requirements for high school graduation and represented a change in philosophy. For the first time, special education was included within a general education framework, requiring the same level of competence of graduating students with handicapping conditions as that of general education students. In terms of training needs, these curriculum standards for special education students necessitated increased knowledge of the curriculum as well as improved strategies for content

delivery.

These regulations became effective September 1985 and will be phased in during the period of 1985-1994. The program plan in this first year was to have high school SETRC trainers develop modules on graduation requirements and equivalency of instruction with training targeted for high schools, appropriate citywide programs, and junior high schools in the regions. The materials developed were distributed and discussed at workshops that served 1,953 teachers, administrators, and clinical personnel. In addition to materials development, 655 hours of training were provided. Despite these efforts, the objective was not attained.

Training School Administrators in Computer Management Systems

Objective 5.2. To provide 20 hours of training to acquaint special education administrators with an understanding of computer management systems.

The intent of this objective was to promote greater efficiency within special education services by providing administrators with an understanding of computer management systems. In conjunction with the Division of Curriculum and Instruction, D.S.E., and the Office of Management Services, SETRC trainers provided 33 hours of workshops training. Thus, the objective was achieved.

Information Dissemination and Technical Assistance

Objective 6.0. To provide local constituents with appropriate information regarding the education of children with handicapping conditions.

The intent of this objective was to broadly disseminate information regarding the education of children with handicapping conditions and to provide technical assistance to teachers on a one-to-one basis. Trainers

disseminated information in a number of ways: they responded to telephone inquiries, both with immediate information and follow-up materials; they conducted needs assessments; and they ordered supplies for classes and programs. SETRC trainers produced two issues of Strategies and Practices, a newsletter of special education, in which they presented the latest research on two topics of interest--motivation and bilingual education.

In response to teacher requests, trainers provide technical assistance as a follow-up to workshop sessions; they also worked with new teachers and teachers in crisis on a one-to-one basis. The procedure one trainer established to work on-site with individual teachers will illustrate the value of technical assistance. After an initial meeting with a teacher during a preparation period, this trainer visited the class and spoke with the children, telling them that she had come to help the teacher to help them. After eliciting their concerns, she met with the teacher to plan strategy. When she returned the next week, she conducted an informal observation, a procedure that continued as long as it proved helpful. When appropriate, she did demonstration lessons and provided materials in desired curriculum areas.

Within this objective, trainers spent 70 percent of their time providing information on methods and materials and instructional management. They spent 14 percent on issues related to the Part 200.6 Regulations and compliance procedures; other topics received less attention.

While the S.E.D. did not specify a required number of hours of technical assistance, 1,131 hours were provided, representing 772 sessions.

Training in Teaching to Limited English-Proficient Students

Objective 7.0. To provide 950 hours of training to school district staff and parents involved with limited English-proficient (LEP) children.

The intent of this objective was to provide school district staff and parents involved with LEP children with the knowledge and skills necessary to better meet the needs of this growing population. Workshops provided training on the following topics: non-biased, non-discriminatory assessment; second language progress indicators; the continuum of placement for LEP students; E.S.L. techniques; bilingual books and curriculum materials; and multicultural education.

Despite the range of topics, the fact that 174 training sessions took place, and that 1,722 participants were served by the workshops, only 504 hours of training took place. Thus, the objective was not achieved.

Training Related to Children Residing in Other Residences

Objective 8.0. To provide 18 hours of training to public and private agency staff responsible for the care and custody of children in residential facilities.

The intent of this objective was to provide public and private agency staff with the increased knowledge and skills necessary to meet the needs of handicapped students. Teachers at Spofford and at New York City Diagnostic Centers received workshops in informal assessment, behavior management, and compliance issues. A particular concern was the development of effective and appropriate training strategies for staff working with a highly transient student population. Because of the increased level of contact between SETRC trainers and agency personnel, communication was fostered between agency and D.S.E. staff. Twenty-

nine hours of training were provided, surpassing the proposed level of activity. Thus, the objective was attained.

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

For each of the program objectives, participants completed workshop evaluation forms in which they rated their pre- and post-session knowledge of topics and evaluated workshop presentations. A total of 16,882 questionnaires were tabulated.

Objective 1.1: Training of General Education Personnel

A total of 405 participants, including general education teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals, completed workshop evaluation forms. Participants indicated their pre- and post-session knowledge of the topic and evaluated the workshop presentation.

Respondents reported their level of knowledge on a seven-point continuum ranging from none to full. In rating their pre-session knowledge, 47 percent of the participants gave one of the three highest ratings (M =4.2, $S.D.$ =1.6), while in rating their post-session knowledge, 73 percent gave one of the three highest ratings (M =5.3, $S.D.$ =1.2). The difference between the means is statistically significant ($p<.001$, t =16.7) and demonstrates a meaningful change in knowledge.

Respondents evaluated the workshop's presentation on a five-point continuum. When asked if the workshop accomplished its goals, 74 percent of the participants gave one of the two highest ratings. On the other items the percentage of respondents giving one of the two highest ratings were as follows: applicability of information, 84 percent; interest level of presentation style, 80 percent; sufficient opportunity

to ask questions and express ideas, 84 percent. Seventy percent of the participants indicated interest in additional training.

Objective 1.3. Training for Non-Special Education Support Personnel

Seven hundred eighty-nine support personnel, including related service providers, guidance counselors, psychologists, nurses, social workers, and physicians, completed workshop evaluation forms. In rating their pre-session knowledge on a seven-point continuum from none to full, 51 percent of the respondents gave one of the three highest ratings (M =4.3, $S.D.$=1.6), while in rating their post-session knowledge, 84 percent gave one of the three highest ratings (M =5.5, $S.D.$ =1.2). The difference between the means is significant ($p<.001$, t = 22.5).

Respondents evaluated the workshop presentations on a five-point continuum. When asked if the workshop accomplished its goals, 84 percent of the participants gave one of the two highest ratings. On other items, the percentage of respondents giving one of the two highest ratings were as follows: applicability of information, 89 percent; interest level of presentation, 79 percent; sufficient opportunity to ask questions and express ideas, 85 percent. Fifty-seven percent responded that they would find additional training beneficial.

Objective 2.0.: Training Based on Local Needs

A total of 16,008 participants completed workshop evaluation forms on this objective. Respondents reported their level of knowledge on a seven-point continuum rating from none to full. In rating their pre-session knowledge, 56 percent of the participants gave one of the three highest ratings (M =4.5, $S.D.$ =1.5), while in rating their post-session knowledge, 82 percent gave one of the three highest ratings (M =5.5,

S.D. =1.3). The difference between the means is significant ($p<.001$, $t = 75.3$).

Respondents evaluated the workshop presentations on a five-point continuum. When asked if the workshop accomplished its goals, 80 percent of the participants gave one of the two highest ratings. On other items, the percentage of respondents giving one of the two highest ratings were as follows: applicability of information, 87 percent; interest level of presentation, 78 percent; sufficient opportunity to ask questions and express ideas, 83 percent. Forty-seven percent of the participants indicated interest in additional training.

Objective 3.0: Training to Board of Education Members

A total of 11 participants completed workshop evaluation forms. Respondents reported their level of knowledge on a seven-point continuum rating from none to full. In rating their pre-session knowledge, 70 percent of the participants gave one of the three highest ratings ($M=4.5$, S.D. =1.0), while in rating their post-session knowledge, 100 percent gave one of the three highest rating ($M =6.0$, S.D.=.4). The difference between the means is significant ($p<.002$, t-4.4).

Respondents evaluated the workshop presentations on a five-point continuum. When asked if the workshop accomplished its goals, 100 percent of the participants gave one of the two highest ratings. On other items, the percentage of respondents giving one of the two highest ratings were as follows: applicability of information, 100 percent; interest level of presentation, 100 percent; sufficient opportunity to ask questions and express ideas, 91 percent. Sixty-three percent of the participants indicated interest in additional training.

Objective 4.1: Training for Parents

A total of 147 participants completed workshop evaluation forms on this objective. Respondents reported their level of knowledge on a seven-point continuum rating from none to full. In rating their pre-session knowledge, 34 percent of the participants gave one of the three highest ratings (M =3.7, S.D. =1.6), while in rating their post-session knowledge, 82 percent gave one of the three highest ratings (M =5.6, S.D. =1.3). The difference between the means is significant ($p<.001$, $t=11.8$).

Respondents evaluated the workshop presentations on a five-point continuum. When asked if the workshop accomplished its goals, 91 percent of the participants gave one of the two highest ratings. On other items, the percentage of respondents giving one of the two highest ratings were as follows: applicability of information, 89 percent; interest level of presentation, 94 percent; sufficient opportunity to ask questions and express ideas, 93 percent. Eighty-three percent of the participants indicated interest in additional training.

Objective 4.2. Training for Parents and Teachers of Pre-school Age Handicapped Children

A total of 62 participants completed workshop evaluation forms on this objective. Respondents reported their level of knowledge on a seven-point continuum rating from none to full. In rating their pre-session knowledge, 71 percent of the participants gave one of the three highest ratings (M-4.9, S.D.=2.3), while in rating their post-session knowledge, 87 percent gave one of the three highest ratings (M=6.0; S.D.=1.3). The difference between the means is significant ($p<.005$, $t=3.0$).

Respondents evaluated the workshop presentations on a five-point continuum. When asked if the workshop accomplished its goals, 90 percent of the participants gave one of the two highest ratings. On other items, the percentage of respondents giving one of the two highest ratings were as follows: applicability of information, 95 percent; interest level of presentation, 97 percent; sufficient opportunity to ask questions and express ideas, 98 percent. Seventy-one percent of the participants indicated interest in additional training.

Objective 5.1: Training in the Regents' Action Plan Initiatives

A total of 568 participants completed workshop evaluation forms on this objective. Respondents reported their level of knowledge on a seven-point continuum rating from none to full. In rating their pre-session knowledge, 45 percent of the participants gave one of the three highest ratings (M =4.1, $S.D.$ =1.7), while in rating their post-session knowledge, 78 percent gave one of the three highest ratings (M =5.4, $S.D.$ =1.3). The difference between the means is significant ($p<.001$, t = 17.4).

Respondents evaluated the workshop presentations on a five-point continuum. When asked if the workshop accomplished its goals, 80 percent of the participants gave one of the two highest ratings. On other items, the percentage of respondents giving one of the two highest ratings were as follows: applicability of information, 87 percent; interest level of presentation, 84 percent; sufficient opportunity to ask questions and express ideas, 99 percent. Fifty-six percent of the participants indicated interest in additional training.

Objective 5.2: Training in Computer Management Systems

A total of 12 participants completed workshop evaluation forms on this objective. Respondents reported their level of knowledge on a seven-point continuum rating from none to full. In rating their pre-session knowledge, none of the participants gave one of the three highest ratings (M =1.5; S.D. =1.0); while in rating their post-session knowledge, 83 percent gave one of the three highest ratings (M =5.0, S.D= 1.1). The difference between the means is significant ($p<.001$, $t = 5.0$).

Respondents evaluated the workshop presentations on a five-point continuum. When asked if the workshop accomplished its goals, 58 percent of the participants gave one of the two highest ratings. On other items, the percentage of respondents giving one of the two highest ratings were as follows: applicability of information, 58 percent; interest level of presentation, 58 percent; sufficient opportunity to ask questions and express ideas, 83 percent. Seventy-five percent of the participants indicated interest in additional training.

Objective 7.0: Training in Teaching Limited English-Proficient Students

A total of 1,128 participants completed workshop evaluation forms on this objective. Respondents reported their level of knowledge on a seven-point continuum rating from none to full. In rating their pre-session knowledge, 43 percent of the participants gave one of the three highest ratings (M =4.1, S.D. =1.6), while in rating their post-session knowledge, 80 percent gave one of the three highest ratings (M =5.4, S.D.=1.2). The difference between the means is significant ($p<.001$, $t = 24.3$).

Respondents evaluated the workshop presentations on a five-point continuum. When asked if the workshop accomplished its goals, 80 percent of the participants gave one of the two highest ratings. On other items, the percentage of respondents giving one of the two highest ratings were as follows: applicability of information, 83 percent; interest level of presentation, 79 percent; sufficient opportunity to ask questions and express ideas, 83 percent. Fifty-two percent of the participants indicated interest in additional training.

Objective 8.0: Training in Teaching Children in Other Residences

A total of 23 participants completed workshop evaluation forms on this objective. Respondents reported their level of knowledge on a seven-point continuum rating from none to full. In rating their pre-session knowledge, 53 percent of the participants gave one of the three highest ratings (M =4.5, $S.D.$ =2.0), while in rating their post-session knowledge, 83 percent gave one of the three highest rating (M =5.5, $S.D.$ =1.2). The difference between the means is significant ($p<.028$, t = 2.5).

Respondents evaluated the workshop presentations on a five-point continuum. When asked if the workshop accomplished its goals, 87 percent of the participants gave one of the two highest ratings. On other items, the percentage of respondents giving one of the two highest ratings were as follows: applicability of information, 83 percent; interest level of presentation, 100 percent; sufficient opportunity to ask questions and express ideas, 96 percent. Ninety percent of the participants indicated interest in additional training.

SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

Participant responses to workshop questionnaires were highly positive.

At all workshops, participants reported a substantial gain in knowledge as a result of the training, a gain that was statistically significant in all cases ($p<.001$, $t = 85.8$). On a seven-point continuum rating from none to full, the number of respondents giving one of the three highest ratings for their pre-session knowledge ranged from 0 to 71 percent,* while the number of respondents giving one of the three highest ratings for their post-session knowledge ranged form 73 to 87 percent. In evaluating the quality of the workshop, the percentage of respondents giving one of the two highest ratings were as follows: degree to which the workshop accomplished its goals, from 58 to 91 percent; applicability of information, from 58 to 95 percent; interest level of presentation, from 58 to 100 percent; and sufficient opportunity to ask questions, from 83 to 96 percent. From 52 to 90 percent of the respondents indicated a need for additional training.

According to participant questionnaires, training in the following objectives led to the greatest change in participants' pre- and post-session knowledge: training of parents (Objectives 4.1 and 4.2), training related to LEP students (Objective 7.0), and training in Regents' Action Plan Initiatives (Objective 5.1 and 5.2).

---

* These figures exclude the responses of Board of Education members, Objective 3.0., since there were no goal hours for that objective.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act Part B SETRC Training Program provided a wide range of training activities to a widely varied audience during the 1984-85 school year. Areas of training included: support for the transition to the Part 200.6 Regulations; training to promote quality of instruction in special education and to encourage mainstreaming and movement to less restrictive environments; and training in the Regents' Action Plan. On request, SETRC trainers also provided technical assistance either in the form of information dissemination or field visits.

In the 1984-85 school year, SETRC training focused on local needs, with most emphasis on training related to the Part 200.6 Regulations. The second major focus was on the quality of instruction, as reflected in the areas of curriculum development and pedagogy. Thus, for example, this year SETRC addressed bilingual curriculum issues for the first time and began to give support to bilingual teachers.

Reflecting the desire of the D.S.E. to eliminate unnecessary referrals into special education, to promote movement to less restrictive environments, and to create effective coordination between special and general education, a substantial amount of training was provided to general educators. This training acquainted them with the Part 200.6 Regulations and aimed to provide them with the knowledge and tools necessary to work effectively with special education students.

Actual training surpassed the proposed number of hours in relation to the following five objectives: training of general education personnel,

training for non-special education support personnel, training based on local needs, training in computer management systems, and training related to children in other residences. While training took place in the following five areas, it did not reach the proposed level: training of occupational education personnel, training for parents, training for parents and teachers of pre-school handicapped children, training in Regents' Action Plan initiatives, and training in teaching LEP students. A number of factors played a role in this inability to deliver the proposed number of hours of training. A major problem was the lack of time in a teacher's day for staff development. Another problem is the lack of sufficient SETRC personnel to meet the training objectives. Finally, it was often difficult to attract parents and occupation educators to training activities.

Despite these difficulties, SETRC made an important contribution to the D.S.E. by addressing existing problems within special education and providing necessary services. Trainers indicated a great sense of satisfaction with their efforts. This year, SETRC training facilitated the transition to the Part 200.6 Regulations and promoted their implementation. In doing so, SETRC not only addressed state and D.S.E. priorities but also helped special education staff to focus on each child's educational needs. One trainer expressed the view of many by saying that SETRC's greatest value was in its ability to pull together the clinical and instructional components of special education and its ability to translate assessment results into instructional strategies.

The following recommendations are aimed at improving the impact of the program.

- Assign program objective training hours to local regions in order to be more responsive to local personnel training needs.

- Encourage the various trainers of D.S.E.' Staff Development Unit to regularly share ideas and materials.

- Continue to provide trainers with training experiences that develop their knowledge of the content of training topics, as well as new staff development methods.

- Encourage the continuing development of a workshop-series model which would provide greater opportunities for feedback from participants on the application of practical workshop topics.